

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

RECEIVED  
23 MAART 2006

PCT

To:

BIRD, William, E.  
Bird Goën & Co.  
Klein Dalenstraat 42A  
B-3020 Winksele  
BELGIQUE

## NOTIFICATION CONCERNING INFORMAL COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE APPLICANT

(PCT Rule 66.6)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	21.03.2006
Applicant's or agent's file reference K3234-PCT	<b>TRANSMITTAL FOR INFORMATION</b>
International application No. PCT/BE2005/000032	International filing date (day/month/year) 04.03.2005
Applicant K.U. LEUVEN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT et al.	

An informal communication took place on 15.03.2006, between the International Preliminary Examining Authority and the applicant / the agent.

A copy of the note on that communication (Form PCT/IPEA/428) is herewith transmitted for your information.

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:   European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	Authorized Officer  Krage, D Tel. +49 89 2399-7530
--	---



**Vertrag über die internationale Zusammenarbeit auf dem Gebiet des Patentwesens**

**Patent Cooperation Treaty**

**Traité de coopération en matière de brevets**

**PCT**

Application No.:

**PCT/BE2005/000032**

**Note on an informal communication by telephone with the Applicant**

A copy of this note is being sent to the Applicant for information

**Participants**

Applicant: K.U. Leuven Research and development et al.

Representative: W. E. Bird

Examiner(s): Klein, D

**Summary of the communication**

I called the applicant's representative concerning the following points :

1. In (most of) the claims figure the word "...isomers...thereof". As this term encompasses also isomers of position, most of the claims would not be new. The applicant's representative agreed to replace the term "isomer" by "stereoisomer", the latter term being defined in the description on page 15.
2. The applicant requested a second written opinion if some objections were to be maintained. As I will maintain one objection concerning inventiveness of new claim 12 and, as the applicant did not comment on this claim, I wanted to know if the applicant would mind getting directly a positive IPER except for this claim and discuss inventiveness of claim 12 in the European Phase to come. The applicant's representative did not mind.

15.03.2006

.....  
Date

Klein, D

.....  
Authorized officer of IPEA

